


**Accreditation Self-Study Steering Committee Notes**  
February 19, 2004 - 8:30 am - Provost's Office

**Attending:** Ronald Troyer, Chair; Sentwali Bakari, John Burney, Jean Berger, John Edwards, Paul Morris, Vicky Payseur, Sue Wright

1. **Statement of Goals:** The committee first discussed the draft statement of goals for the process that was handed out (see attached). The following were among the points raised in discussion:
  - A. **Mission Statement:** Do we need to make the mission more specific to Drake? It was noted that the statement was revised a few years ago by the Board, but that the statement and all "mission documents" should be reviewed as a part of the process. A particular focus might be whether the documents sufficiently address "student outcomes" as called for by HLC.
  - B. It was agreed that we need an overarching statement within which to couch any specifics that might be included in the goals. Ron agreed to draft an overall university goal statement. 
  - C. We discussed the fact that as we move forward a part of the document that is developed will need to note and draw on the extensive working of Planning and Review.
2. **Structuring the Process:** Discussion focused on the pros and cons of organizing the self-study according to Cross-Cutting Themes versus the accreditation criteria.
  - A. It was agreed that the Drake Strategic Plan would not provide a good basis for structuring the self-study. Using the Criteria or Cross-Cutting Themes will allow us to continue to update and strengthen our Mission documents and Strategic Plan.
  - B. Several people commented that the Cross-Cutting Themes offer a more interesting way (than Criteria) in which to focus a discussion at the University. Such a self-study would have greater likelihood of becoming a part of the ongoing conversation at Drake that would have implications beyond the self-study.
  - C. It was noted that Criteria have been developed by the HLC in consultation with a lot of faculty and administrators at various universities. They are laid out clearly and would provide a ready format for the self-study.
  - D. Also noted that no matter what, we must address the criteria and their components.
  - E. The consensus was that we should explore a merging of the Cross-Cutting Themes and Criteria. We might try to write the report as a relatively brief document organized according to the Cross-Cutting Themes. The appendices can reflect the Criteria – but cross-indexed with the Themes.

→ Sue agreed to work on a document that would provide guidelines for structuring the self-study in this way.

3. There was further discussion of processes to be aware of over the course of the self-study.
  - A. We must do a great deal to ensure that the campus as a whole is involved with the self-study and that all constituencies are aware of the Themes by the time the self-study is complete.
  - B. It was suggested that the 2004 Summer Administrative Retreat should be organized around discussion of the Cross-Cutting Themes.
4. Three future meeting times were set – all at 8:30 am in the Provost's Office:
  - March 4
  - March 18
  - April 1